

## Religion: Oxford Research Encyclopedias

### Liturgical Theology

Joris Geldhof

Online Publication Date: Mar  
2015

Subject: Christianity

DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780199340378.013.14

### Summary and Keywords

Liturgical theology studies the meaning of Christian worship. Although it is a relatively recent approach, it is solidly anchored in the Christian tradition. Its present shape, fame, and impact would not be what they are and its major representatives would not be able to do what they are doing without the lasting influence of the Liturgical Movement and some inspiring figures that helped shape its theological profile. Their ideas and writings were widely received beyond linguistic and denominational borders and continue to be influential in the early 21st century. More concretely, the key to comprehending what liturgical theologians do lies in their appeal to and usage of the liturgy, broadly understood as the Church's ritual, prayer, and worship practices. Therefore, liturgical theology is not so much a subdiscipline corresponding with a specific object of research and requiring a set of specialized methods, but rather a way of theologizing pertaining to the entire scope and content of the Christian faith and religion. Liturgical theologians interpret the liturgy as the normative horizon for any theoretical theological reflection and take the liturgy not as the only but definitely as the primary source for theology. This operational principle is reflected in the age-old adage *lex orandi, lex credendi*, which in its earliest formulation implies that the "law of faith," or belief content, is determined, or shaped, by the "law of prayer," or liturgical praxis. Because liturgical theology is still a field in full development, it faces a lot of challenges for the future—both within the Church and in the academy—but at the same time entails a promising ecumenical potential.

Keywords: ecclesia orans, lex orandi lex credenda, prima theologia, worship, meaning, ordo, symbolism, latreia, doxology, sanctification.

### The Study of the Meaning of Christian Worship

Liturgical theology is the study of the meaning of Christian worship. This is a challenging task, because it is neither evident nor easy to define what the Christian liturgy actually is, let alone to determine what its meaning(s) could be. A lot of factors have to be taken into account, not least among which are denominational, historical, anthropological, and cultural ones. It is therefore important to realize straight away that a diversity of approaches and perspectives, as well as a certain fluidity with regard to its scope, goal, and research results, are intrinsic to this reflexive and outstandingly theological discipline. It will come as no surprise, then, that liturgical theologians devote a great amount of energy to meticulous reflections about the essence or the nature of Christian liturgy.

The search for an adequate understanding and description of Christian liturgy is intrinsically connected with the history of the Liturgical Movement, which, regardless of several antecedents in the 19th century, came into being, developed, and flourished above all in the 20th century. This movement was broadly ramified beyond the boundaries of the major Christian denominations. The basic analysis of its representatives was that the people of God, that is, the Church, by and large did not sufficiently (intensively) partake in the dynamics of God's saving mystery as mediated liturgically through the sacraments and the divine office (or liturgy of the hours). In other words, the active, full, and conscious participation of all the faithful needed to be enhanced,<sup>1</sup> the study of the liturgy had to be promoted, and the true "liturgical spirit" (*spiritus liturgicus*) should permeate the heart and soul of every Christian.<sup>2</sup> Arguably, this encompassing program is still in the process of being realized and forms the background for the work of many a contemporary liturgical theologian when they try to come to terms with what

that actually is, liturgy.<sup>3</sup>

Among the Liturgical Movement, there seems to have been a broad consensus that liturgy must be distinguished from both private prayer (which is seldom ritual) and devotional exercises (which can be embedded in rites but do not necessarily coincide with the Church's official prayer).<sup>4</sup> At the same time, it is important not to see the liturgy too limited; it is a reality which can and must be approached from various perspectives, among which are definitely also art and music.<sup>5</sup> In any case, a certain rituality and an official sanctioning by relevant ecclesial authorities seems intrinsic to liturgy. Moreover, the liturgy is always public, or "*offenbar*" in German, which suggests a deep connection with God's revelation (*Offenbarung*), or will to be known.

One of the shortest definitions proposed in the bosom of the Liturgical Movement, which goes back to Dom Lambert Beauduin's influential musings and insights about the liturgy, is the Church at prayer (*ecclesia orans*). The two components each deserve to be briefly elaborated. First, when one uses the concept "Church," it is not just the institution which is implied, but always and necessarily both the assembly of the faithful (*congregatio fidelium*) and the communion of saints (*communio sanctorum*).<sup>6</sup> The liturgy is celebrated by those people who are gathered by God at a certain time and place and who have, in doing so, been put in conjunction with the universal Church. The universality of this community has to be understood in a geographical as well as temporal sense: it crosses through the times and spaces with which we are familiar.<sup>7</sup> Second, the term "prayer" here does not denote the individual conversation with God, but the structured dialogue between God and humanity inasmuch as it has developed itself throughout the centuries and in accordance with the biblical witness. Moreover, to define the liturgy as the Church at prayer denotes an ongoing activity instead of an accomplished initiative, a free invitation instead of an enforced obligation, and a sweeping dynamic instead of a rigid set of rules.

The broadly shared feelings of discomfort vis-à-vis the "rubrics" was essential for liturgical theology to develop. For there was a lot of meaning to be discovered behind and beyond the red prescriptions and black text passages of the traditional liturgical books. For centuries, however, particularly in the West, the study of the liturgy had been approached from a juridical or canonical angle and failed to see its astonishing *symbolic depth*.<sup>8</sup> Students had above all been explained how to precisely carry out what the rubrics stipulated. But the genuine theological, symbolic, spiritual, and pastoral meaning of the liturgy had often escaped them. Clearly, liturgical theology emerged out of a lack of understanding and sensitivity. That the liturgy was a primary bearer of the Church's faith, and that it was possible—yet even desirable—to explicate this theologically, was a relatively new insight that has gradually gained importance in all kinds of theological and ecclesial circles throughout the 20th century.

### Liturgy Bearing Theological Meaning

That the liturgy contains and expresses theological content may seem obvious, but there is a long tradition maintaining that the most appropriate and trustworthy bearer of Christian belief contents is doctrine. The Church and her magisterial office would be the receptors, warrantors, and promoters of orthodox faith, as predominantly exemplified in council documents and letters published by church leaders. Correspondingly, the dogmatic tradition of the Church and the writings of preeminent scholars would function as the major sources and references for all questions related to the content of the Christian faith and religion. This widespread conviction undoubtedly betrays a thorough cognitive bias and tends to exclusively focus on text material. Liturgical theology is not meant to deny the value of either knowledge and reason or written discourse but rather aims to complement it with sources of a different origin and kind. It can therefore be said to be essentially synthetic.

According to the leading liturgical scholar Aimé-Georges Martimort (1911–2000), the liturgy itself is characterized by a fundamental double movement,<sup>9</sup> in which God and humanity are intertwined.<sup>10</sup> On the one hand, the liturgy is the collective act of Christians worshiping God whom they call Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Through liturgical celebrations Christians render honor to God, express gratitude toward him for his redemptive initiative toward humanity, and petition him to continue to be as merciful as he has always shown to be to previous generations. This doxological or latreutic dimension of the liturgy (from the Greek *latreia*, meaning worship and priestly service) is definitely in line with the Old and New Testament and determines the nature of the liturgy and, as such, the entire life of the Church.<sup>11</sup> On the other hand, liturgy intimately participates in the divine saving mystery and its economy in history. The liturgy does not only display a world of signs referring to Jesus Christ but in and of itself, that is, ontologically, partakes in the sanctification of the world and all its living inhabitants. To explore this realism is an

important task for liturgical theology.

Sometimes this double movement is called in technical jargon the anabatic (or ascending: from humans to God) and katabatic (or descending: from God to humanity) aspect of Christian liturgy. More important, however, are the theological implications of this. First, it means that the liturgy is to be situated at the crossroads of the encounter between God and human beings.<sup>12</sup> It is exactly there where Jesus Christ, the incarnate Son of God, had been and shares in and passes on the message and reality of the entire paschal mystery.<sup>13</sup> This intersection-nature of the liturgy can be meaningfully connected with the significance of the cross and its horizontal and vertical axes. For, indeed, the veneration of the cross is revealing of the liturgy as a whole.<sup>14</sup> Second, the liturgy is an eminent part of the Christian tradition. It would be difficult to overestimate the constitutive role of the liturgy for the past, present, and future of Christian communities.<sup>15</sup> It has a deep impact on their identity: on what they do and think, find important or neglect, say and suppress, desire and leave behind, avoid or strive after, and so on. Third, the explicit belief contents of Christians, or dogmas, are always embedded in a life of prayer and worship. There is not a single Christian dogma which does not in one way or another suppose the life of the liturgy. Liturgical theology takes all these implications very seriously, investigates their complexities, reflects upon them, and attempts to fully understand them in conversation with diverging cultures in different and rapidly evolving societies.

Because the liturgy is so essential for any hermeneutics of the Christian tradition and because it shares ontologically in the divine economy of salvation, it touches upon the entirety as well as the specificity of Christian faith. In other words, there is an inextricable link between liturgy and revelation. Liturgy, and sacraments in particular, can be understood as the continuation of God's revelation in the life, words, works, death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus Christ and the communication thereof to his people. Liturgy itself *is* the communication of God; it is not simply the means, the expression or the channel of that. Liturgy, moreover, is the work of God (*opus Dei*) and at the same time the work of the people (whence the etymology of the word "liturgy," public service). The subtle collaboration of divinity and humanity, grace and human effort, the supernatural and the natural, inasmuch as they are observable in and through the liturgy, is explored and explained by liturgical theologians.

It should come as no surprise, then, that the scope of liturgical theology extends from God's unity and Trinity, immanent as well as economic, to Christology and soteriology, pneumatology, ecclesiology, eschatology, and every other "chapter" of classical dogmatics which one could possibly imagine.<sup>16</sup> The liturgy is an intrinsic part of the meta-narrative of Christian faith: God creating a world, placing a partner in it, who betrays him but is given the opportunity to restore what went wrong, and who is still on a journey toward final fulfillment. In that respect, liturgy is an essential element in the building and maintaining of God's reign. Liturgical theology does not differ from dogmatic, or systematic, theology in that it would deal with another "object" but because it takes another stance toward it. It starts from the Church's traditional and official ritual repertoire, not from doctrinal declarations or theological considerations.

### Liturgical Theology and the Liturgical Movement

The attention for the theological quality of the liturgy is intrinsically interwoven with the Liturgical Movement. Already Dom Lambert Beauduin (1873–1960), a monk of the abbey of Mont César, who is generally considered to have initiated the movement by a talk he gave in 1909,<sup>17</sup> had envisioned an encompassing theological role for the liturgy. In the many contributions he wrote in the periodical he founded, *Les Questions liturgiques et paroissiales* (now the bilingual journal *Questions Liturgiques/Studies in Liturgy*), Lambert Beauduin steadily connected liturgical items with doctrinal and theological ones. Moreover, in the booklet he composed briefly after the 1909 event, originally entitled *La piété de l'église* but aptly translated by Dom Virgil Michel (1888–1938) as *Liturgy: The Life of the Church*,<sup>18</sup> he made it very clear that, for him, liturgy was not just a practical affair to be arranged by competent clerical powers but an ecclesial reality of utmost importance for the entire life of the Church, including the work of theologians.

However, it was a fellow brother (and good friend) of his, Dom Maïeul Cappuyns, who wrote the first extensive article which addressed the relation between liturgy and theology. The article appeared in the journal Beauduin had founded and has a simple twofold structure.<sup>19</sup> First, Cappuyns surveys the history of dogmatics and its structural relation to the liturgy, which, he argues, has been systematically overlooked. He understands dogmatics in a quite classical and limited way, namely, as the body of doctrinal expressions authorized by qualified ecclesial

bodies (like, for example, council statements). Second, Cappuyns considers the reflection about those official magisterial teachings and basically makes a similar point: the tradition of theology cannot be seen independently from the development of the liturgy.

Most interesting, however, is the introduction to Cappuyns's text and the method he employs. Cappuyns opens his article with a sharp analysis (and hardly hidden criticism) of the consistent neglect of the liturgy in authoritative Church teachings as well as in theological reflection and scholarship. He demonstrates this through ample references to primary literature taken from a wide variety of patristic sources. He includes liturgical and disciplinary texts next to a selection of commentaries by Latin and Greek authors from the 2nd until the 5th centuries. One could almost say this is an excellent illustration of *ressourcement*: one draws the inspiration from the origins of something in order to renew or revive it in an ulterior era.

Two other figures which must be mentioned in the context of the emerging Liturgical Movement are Romano Guardini (1885–1968) and Dom Odo Casel (1886–1948). Romano Guardini was a German diocesan priest of Italian descent. He became a professor of theology in Berlin (before World War II) and Munich (after the war) and is known to have been a particularly talented speaker. Guardini was especially engaged in youth ministry; most famous were the summer recollections he held in the framework of the so-called Quickborn Movement.<sup>20</sup> In the very first issue of the *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* (now *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*), the journal founded by Odo Casel and his abbot Ildefons Herwegen, Guardini published a reflection about the systematic method in liturgical studies.<sup>21</sup> This article appeared only a few years after his groundbreaking essay *Vom Geist der Liturgie* in 1918.<sup>22</sup> In the article, Guardini expresses the need to interpret liturgy not only from a historical viewpoint. Since the liturgy is the actual cult and worship of living communities of faith, it is necessary to employ a systematic approach. Guardini interprets the meaning of the concept "systematic" quite literally, in the sense of keeping or bringing together. This is all the more appropriate, he argues, because the liturgy itself is something which connects and obliges ("*etwas Verbindliches*"), just like law. Furthermore, Guardini firmly holds that liturgy is a vital reality, organically intertwined with the life of faith and the Church, and that, therefore, liturgical studies is (and should be) an integral part of theology.

Odo Casel was a monk of the Benedictine abbey of Maria Laach in the Rhineland, Germany. He counts as one of the pioneers of the Liturgical Movement and is mostly known for his so-called *Mysterienlehre* (literally doctrine of the mysteries), which is steadily associated with his 1922 book entitled *Die Liturgie als Mysterienfeier* and, maybe even more so, with his 1932 compilation of articles *Das christliche Kultmysterium*.<sup>23</sup> Casel's basic intuition sprouted forth both from detailed historical and philological research and from a profound theological conviction.<sup>24</sup> In line with the work of other scholars before him, Casel realized the impact of the rediscovery that the concepts of sacrament (*sacramentum*) and mystery (*mysterium*) actually largely overlap in ancient Latin. This insight implied not only a contribution to etymological knowledge or to the history of ideas but launched a paradigm shift in the theological study of sacraments and liturgy. The then still prevailing scholastic model, which focused the attention exclusively on seven official cultic rituals instituted by Jesus Christ and performed by his Church, was substantially broadened. A fine-tuned sensitivity for the deeply theological character of the notion of mystery, as in ancient Christendom, could finally flourish again and bring about a fundamental and encompassing renewal of liturgical and sacramental theology.<sup>25</sup> In addition, Casel had studied ancient Greek and Roman religions, which made him aware that there was an emphatic parallel between the mystery cults and the process of Christian initiation (sacraments). It was, however, above all the Pauline interpretation of mystery that marked his own theological trajectory and position. Mystery, Casel demonstrated, is first and foremost the act by which God makes himself known to humanity (which, therefore, largely coincides with the concept of revelation), particularly in its salvific mode as exemplified by the Christ event, and second the complex of actions by which all of this is sacramentally continued in history—or, indeed, the liturgy.

### Liturgy as Theology

Another prominent branch of liturgical theology came into being through the work of the Orthodox theologian Alexander Schmemmann (1916–1983). Schmemmann was a Russian emigrant from Estonia who grew up in France and later became the leading figure of St Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary in Crestwood, New York. His doctoral dissertation was the basis of his groundbreaking *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*,<sup>26</sup> the Russian version of which was published in Paris in 1961. It is evident that Schmemmann was deeply influenced by the vibrant

theological culture of postwar Paris, and by the Liturgical Movement in particular. The most challenging ideas Schmemann defended were integrated, promoted, and further developed by Aidan Kavanagh (1929–2006), an American Benedictine monk from the abbey of Saint Meinrad who became dean of Yale Divinity School and was involved in the Liturgical Movement in the United States. Kavanagh is the author of an exceptionally eloquently written and thought-provoking book, *On Liturgical Theology*.<sup>27</sup> The inspiration of both Schmemann and Kavanagh continued in the work of many other trendsetting thinkers. Among them, David W. Fagerberg and Gordon W. Lathrop and their respective books, *Theologia Prima: What is Liturgical Theology?* (2004) and *Holy Things: A Liturgical Theology* (1993), definitely deserve mention.<sup>28</sup>

What is common in the work of all these authors, although there are significant differences in matters of style, is a powerful theological conviction that liturgy is primary theology, in such a way that it cannot be instrumentalized for any idea or ideology. They insist that the liturgy requires that it is taken for what it really is. Since, according to them, liturgy itself *is* theology, it imposes a peculiar way of feeling and understanding to an endeavor which is usually seen as merely intellectual, reflexive or, for that matter, speculative. What this means can best be explained by the interpretation of the age-old adage *lex orandi, lex credendi* put forward by these scholars, by their insistence on the difference between primary and secondary theology, by their appeal to the outstandingly practical nature of liturgy, and by their corresponding understanding of the concepts of orthodoxy and *ordo*.

**(1)** As a matter of fact, the wording *lex orandi, lex credendi* (“the law of prayer [is] the law of faith”) is a derivative of a sentence taken from the work of Prosper of Aquitaine, a 5th-century Church father engaged in an anti-Pelagian controversy on grace.<sup>29</sup> The passage reads as follows: [ . . . ] *ut legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi* (PL 51, 209), “so that the law of beseeching determines [or founds or grounds] the law of believing.” The point that Prosper was making, was that the rightness of a theological position was additionally justified by the content of the prayers actually used in liturgy. When the above-mentioned liturgical theologians refer to the original formulation, their crucial point is that, unlike the reduced but much more common version, there is no simple equality between the regime of prayer (which is equaled with *liturgy*) and the regime of faith (and its intellectual interpreter *theology*). Rather, the liturgy is the fundament or foundation of theology and faith.<sup>30</sup> Schmemann said that the liturgical tradition is nothing less than the “ontological condition” for theology.<sup>31</sup> Kavanagh explains: “The verb *statuat* subordinates the law of belief to the law of worship in just the same way, and for just the same reasons, as our reception of God’s Word is subordinated to the presentation of that Word to us in the act of its being revealed and proclaimed to us.”<sup>32</sup>

**(2)** The interpretation of Prosper’s adage is closely connected with the distinction between primary and secondary theology. Put very briefly, primary theology stands for the actual liturgy, whereas secondary theology is the (academic) reflection upon it. The first is done in churches (or other venues where Christians gather for liturgical worship), the second is communicated above all through written media. Schmemann, Kavanagh, Fagerberg, and Lathrop have no doubts about the absolute priority of the first over the second. That priority, however, may not be the most emphatic feature of their position. That actual liturgies are called *theology* is even more astonishing. It implies that the primary elucidation and interpretation of the Christian faith is not to be sought in books, thoughts, and ideas but in an eminently sensual reality touching the entirety of human existence.

**(3)** It will come as no surprise, then, that there is a strong anti-intellectualist and egalitarian dimension among these liturgical theologians, which goes along with an insistence on the liturgy’s downright and irreducible practical nature. A liturgical act, says Kavanagh, “is *proletarian* in the sense that it is not done by academic elites; it is *communitarian* in the sense that it is not undertaken by the scholar alone in his [sic] study; and it is *quotidian* in the sense that it is not accomplished occasionally but regularly throughout the daily, weekly, and yearly round of the assembly’s life of public liturgical worship.”<sup>33</sup> Here lies also the basis for Kavanagh’s descriptions of Mrs. Murphy. This invented figure is not a scholar but a simple woman, who has been wrought by lifelong immersion in liturgical celebrations.

**(4)** This predominantly practical, or action-focused, interpretation of liturgy makes one understand how it comes that *orthodoxy*, for Kavanagh, is not so much “doctrinal accuracy” but above all “right worship.”<sup>34</sup> This is again only comprehensible from the etymology of the word: *orthoos* means indeed right or correct, whereas *doxa* refers to the act of veneration and glorification (as in doxology). It would be challenging to investigate what a more consistent liturgical interpretation could be than the notional and ecclesial ones with which one usually works. Orthodoxy, thus understood, is also related to the concept of *ordo*, the basic structure and content which the liturgy preserves and passes on through many ways. Especially Schmemann



and Lathrop developed this concept in quite some depth.

These four themes are sometimes fiercely debated among liturgical scholars, for it is not evident that the claims can be supported by competent historical research or concrete contemporary illustrations.<sup>35</sup> There have indeed been instances where liturgy influenced the course of the history of dogma, but the reverse is also true: there are cases where the liturgy followed theological ideas or ecclesial decisions.<sup>36</sup> However, it is important that liturgical theologians continue to discuss and reflect upon these matters.

### The Interdisciplinary Nature of Liturgical Theology

Liturgical theology is intrinsically and necessarily interdisciplinary. The motivation for that is not to imitate contemporary scholarly fashions. Rather, the reason is that the phenomenon under consideration is so multifaceted that it cannot be encapsulated within the confines of one or another well-established (or emerging) scientific discipline. The nature of the liturgy itself contradicts any methodological or disciplinary narrowness and requires a synthetic approach throughout. Romano Guardini had rightly indicated this in the early 1920s (cf. *supra*).

Already the basic question of what the liturgy is exactly, brings forth a whole bunch of questions. The answers to these questions make use of concepts and vocabularies that tie in with many non-liturgical and even non-theological discourses. It is, for example, a challenging question for liturgical theologians what the most appropriate fundamental category is to grasp the essence of the liturgy. Definitions and descriptions of liturgy frequently make use of terms like action, mystery, rite, worship, cult, work, prayer, celebration, task, communion, encounter, and the like but none of them is ultimately satisfactory. In trying to establish some conceptual clarity, liturgical theologians are required to dialogue with and evaluate cognate disciplines where these categories are also used and where the realities they evoke are seriously studied. The difference with these other fields may be that, for liturgical theologians, the liturgy is never only an *object* of research but also, always, a source for thought.

It is helpful to distinguish between an “*ad intra*” and an “*ad extra*” interdisciplinarity, that is, an interdisciplinarity within theology and an interdisciplinarity with other disciplines. With respect to intra-theological interdisciplinarity, it is evident that liturgical theology touches upon every theological (sub-)discipline. There are clear connections to biblical exegesis,<sup>37</sup> to church history,<sup>38</sup> to systematic,<sup>39</sup> sacramental<sup>40</sup> and moral theology,<sup>41</sup> to spirituality,<sup>42</sup> as well as to every branch covered by pastoral and practical theology.<sup>43</sup> Because and insofar as the liturgy and the celebration of the sacraments belong to the very core of the Christian religion, not a single aspect of the study of it is irrelevant. Liturgical theologians usually have a domain with which they are more familiar than others but this doesn’t relieve them of the duty to always look for general theological pertinence and be in dialogue with specialists in “other” theological fields. If liturgical theology is the spine of the theological skeleton, there is a clear connection with all the ribs and the skull, but without the bones of the legs and feet it would not be able to walk. In this metaphor, the skull and the ribs would be the different branches of theology, the bones of the legs real liturgies.

Something similar is true for liturgical theology’s interdisciplinarity *ad extra*. Since liturgical theologians are not the only ones who have something meaningful to contribute to the study of the worship and ritual practices of Christians, they are called to be in continuous dialogues with other scholars. These dialogues are interesting both at a methodological level and with regard to the content. Exhaustiveness cannot be aimed at here, but some examples will suffice. The work of philosophers who employ liturgy as directive of their thoughts is extremely relevant for liturgical theology; one can think here of, among others, Jean-Yves Lacoste,<sup>44</sup> Catherine Pickstock,<sup>45</sup> Jean-Luc Marion,<sup>46</sup> and Giorgio Agamben.<sup>47</sup> A great stimulus for liturgical theology is also the combination of literary studies and the history of ideas, as in the work of Regina Schwartz and Juliette Day.<sup>48</sup> Still other conversation partners are as diverse as the social sciences,<sup>49</sup> semiotics and cultural studies,<sup>50</sup> anthropology and ritual studies,<sup>51</sup> theater and performance theory,<sup>52</sup> and women and gender studies<sup>53</sup>—not to say anything about music<sup>54</sup> and the arts.<sup>55</sup>

### The Ecumenical Potential of Liturgical Theology

The model of liturgical theology entails an enormous but not always duly acknowledged ecumenical potential. This

is not only evident from its history throughout the 20th and early 21st century but, first and foremost, from its intrinsic nature and the methods with which it operates. Liturgical theology is something which is not developed by representatives of one (dominant) denomination only, but something typical of any Christian who takes liturgy as a point of departure or as the horizon of theological reflection. In this respect, it must be said immediately that there still exist many biases. Liturgy is not exclusively the concern of Orthodox and Catholic Christians—which is amply shown by the work of many prominent Protestant liturgical theologians<sup>56</sup> and by concrete attempts to overcome all too easy schemas.<sup>57</sup>

Interestingly, liturgical theology does not fall easily into the classical lines of division between different Christian denominations. This is precisely because their major concern and scope is not determined by fine distinctions in sacramental theological speculations. In addition, one must point to a telling non-coincidence of liturgical and denominational borders, inasmuch as there are Orthodox, Catholic, and Anglican Christians, for example, who celebrate the liturgy according to Byzantine or oriental liturgical traditions. The relevance of many works by Orthodox liturgical theologians clearly surpass the boundaries of the ecclesial communities they belong to.<sup>58</sup> One could say, therefore, that liturgical theology rather interprets than asserts, rather searches than announces, and rather questions than promotes.

Fortunately, also official bodies of the churches have stimulated the case and the interests of liturgical theology. Two documents have shown to be particularly influential beyond the boundaries of individual denominations, the report on *Baptism, Eucharis and, Ministry* (BEM) issued by the World Council of Churches (1982) and *Sacrosanctum concilium* (SC), the constitution on the liturgy by the Second Vatican Council (1963). The reception of these documents by liturgical theologians has been largely positive, but critical questions pertaining to Church polity did arise, of course, for example, with regard to authority and liturgical regulation and legislation.

### Future Challenges

Liturgical theology has never been an easygoing endeavor. It is not uncommon that there is a great amount of suspicion toward it. Because the discipline doesn't seem to fit well into the classical distinctions which determine the outline of theological studies up until the present day, there is still a great need to position liturgical theology within the context of contemporary scholarship and the ecclesial landscape. In particular, four areas of future challenges can be distinguished.

**1)** First of all, the precision of the method(s) with which liturgical theologians operate must be refined. This should be done both by meta-methodological (and systematic-theological) reflection and by the elaboration of concrete cases, that is, both by theoretical creativity and by practical wisdom. The major question remains how it is possible to draw theological insight from, or through, liturgical data. If one admits that these data are not just texts which are (to be) approached with philological, historical, linguistic, literary, and hermeneutical methods,<sup>59</sup> it is not yet clear what the best way is to delineate and investigate them.<sup>60</sup> There is a broad consensus among liturgical scholars that the object of their research is not *only* text material,<sup>61</sup> but what this means in relation to an output which is, paradoxically, above all written, is not entirely clear. Moreover, it is one thing to maintain that real liturgies are theology par excellence; it is quite another thing to effectively employ these liturgies in theological research and reflection.

If it is true that liturgies are genuine, and even primary, sources, it is not only important to repeat this with insistence and indignation whenever one supposes one does not sufficiently realize this, but also to develop this insight and sensitivity into a credible research program. If, for instance, one should integrate the structure of the liturgical year into systematic-theological reflections about the figure of Christ or the relation between faith and time, one cannot suffice with a well-selected illustration from one or another ceremony or liturgical book. One will have to delve deeply into the structure, history, and composition of the liturgical year and make fruitful the patterns discerned for the ongoing theological understanding of the matter under discussion. In any case, there is a great need for liturgical theologians to further develop their discipline and to refine their liturgical and theological intuitions so that they can be employed in a methodologically stable and credible, yet innovative, fashion.

**2)** The second challenge for liturgical theology's future is closely related with the above considerations. Liturgical theologians need to think how their discipline relates to philosophy and the humanities at large. Philosophers are ideally placed to ask questions about meaning and symbols; the humanities offer valuable

knowledge and insight into who the human being is and what they typically do. The ways in which the human being is entangled in networks of symbolic and other meanings and in which these intricacies are essential for happiness and existence, are of paramount importance for liturgical theologians. For questions related to the origin of worship are not limited to historical queries. The very fact that there seems to be meaning at all and the ways in which meaning works reveal layers of wisdom and cognition beyond the limits and the scope of existing and prevailing epistemologies. But these issues are telling for liturgical theology, since the human being as a worshiping being is definitely a matter to be further explored together with many scholars and thinkers from different backgrounds and specialisms.

**3)** Third, the relevance and implications of liturgical theology for pastoral praxis and spirituality need to be explicated with more vigor and daring. Liturgical theologians generally have concrete suggestions for the pastoral field but they are not often well received. Nevertheless, the ideas of liturgical theologians are usually grounded in the tradition of celebrating faith communities, while these faith communities themselves may have become alienated from their own history. Liturgical theology can remind them of their origin and destination and thereby contribute to their search for identity. Frequently, the problem with which many communities are confronted, has to do with a kind of detachment from the liturgy. The liturgy has grown into an independent business, which is no longer organically connected with the core of the community's and its members' life. Liturgical theology might help to refocus and to reintegrate worship in all the different dimensions of the Church's life.

**4)** The fourth challenge of liturgical theology is to address issues that come up in the context of religious pluralism and interreligious dialogue. Liturgical theologians are in an excellent position to explore the ritual heritage of Christians. Rituality, however, is a delicate issue in the context of interreligious encounters. As long as one compares belief contents, prays together, exchanges ideas about how to improve the quality of life, jointly addresses matters of ecology and justice, and so on, great progress has been made. Lots of people can testify to intense experiences, which impacted on their personal lives and sometimes also on the dynamics of their communities. But, the ritual heart of the respective religions is scarcely touched upon in similar encounters.<sup>62</sup> Moreover, this ritual heart is often a real stumbling block. People feel uncomfortable in concrete ritual settings of other religions and may behave inappropriately, even beyond their intentions. Reversely, welcoming members of other religions in the center of one's ritual celebrations is a very delicate thing. To say the least, not many religious communities are open for this kind of adventure. Therefore, unsurprisingly, many Christians experience a kind of schizophrenic situation. On the one hand, they feel they must continue on the path of interreligious encounters. On the other hand, they sense they are betraying their own tradition if they pursue these encounters and come to a point where there is a full ritual communion between them and the religious other. Hospitality then seems to contradict orthodoxy!

It will be important for liturgical theologians to offer their specific expertise to theology and the Church in matters of interreligious dialogue and encounters, so that the debate around these issues is not only occupied by dogmatic statements, ethical concerns, and spiritual commitments. In particular, liturgical theologians are called to share their expertise with comparative theologians and scholars in the fields of interreligious dialogue and theologies of religions.

### Historiography

Strictly speaking, liturgical theology is quite recent a branch on the tree of Christian theology, dating only from the beginning of the 20th century. It is usually seen as one of the three pillars of liturgical studies,<sup>63</sup> which itself came only into being in the course of the 19th century. Liturgical studies are commonly said to consist of the historiography of the liturgy, the exploration of its theological meaning, and pastoral liturgy. It would employ, correspondingly, historical, theological, and practical methods. Very often, however, there has not been a proper balance between the three pillars. It is not an exaggeration to assert that there has long been an almost unquestioned dominance of historical and philological scholarship focusing on the edition of liturgical manuscripts and the study of their context of origin and reception history. Some scholars even hold that liturgical studies grew out of Church history<sup>64</sup> or emphasize its resemblance with biblical exegesis. In other words, liturgical theology and pastoral liturgy have never been the best elaborated parts of liturgical studies. Maybe something similar is true after the field of liturgical studies had gone through the anthropological and linguistic turn, as a consequence of which not history but ritual studies has become a privileged partner, at least at a methodological level.<sup>65</sup>



The fact that liturgical theology is still relatively young does not mean, of course, that there are no antecedents in the history of the Church. There are many beautiful examples of pastors and theologians who explored the theological and spiritual contents of the rites and ceremonies their communities had inherited. For reasons of clarity and focus, the European chronology of Antiquity, Middle Ages, and modernity is followed here.

Particularly worth mentioning for the period of Antiquity are the so-called mystagogical catecheses, in which the bishops explained the meaning of the rites of initiation to the newly baptized, and in which they connected this with the entire reach of the life of faith. This unique genre of liturgico-theological (and deeply spiritual) writing was practiced by Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Ambrose of Milan (all of which are to be situated in the 4th century CE). According to several scholars, one can safely add some of Augustine of Hippo's writings to this list. Typical of these mystagogical catecheses is their creative use of typology, which was backed both by Platonic patterns of thought and an interpretation of salvation history which was deeply indebted to Scripture.

After the breakdown of the Roman Empire in the late 5th century, which implied an increasing alienation from classical Greco-Roman culture and its many philosophies, it was no longer possible to produce mystagogical catecheses.<sup>66</sup> Not only had their humus vanished, but also new practices and circumstances had arisen. The baptism of infants had become regular and the vast majority of the population converted to Christianity. Methodologically speaking, the use of biblical typologies, which assumed a certain kind of Neoplatonic metaphysics, was slowly replaced by analogies.<sup>67</sup> This was a much less stable and convincing interpretation framework and soon gave rise to fragmentariness. The explanation of the meaning of rites typical of the Middle Ages consisted of free associations and pious applications, with a risk of becoming arbitrary. Great examples of this kind of liturgical theology are Amalarius of Metz's *De ecclesiasticis officiis* (9th century) and Guillaume Durand de Mende's *Rationale divinarum officiorum* (13th century). Both are treatises of considerable length which each survey and discusses the different aspects and components of liturgical celebrations, with a clear focus on the mass.

Modern times are characterized by a certain silence regarding theological engagements with liturgy. This may above all have to do with the impact of the Council of Trent (1545–1563) and its reaction to the Reformation. The right interpretation of the sacraments had been a big issue in the discussions between Catholics and Protestants. The liturgy itself had been regulated more strictly than ever before by the Roman Catholic Church whereas the Protestants developed many different forms of prayer and celebration. The whole climate, however, was not favorable to develop a genuine liturgical theology worthy of its name. A slight opening was created only in the 19th century, when the Catholic *Tübinger Schule* in Germany was instrumental in the emergence of the first manuals of liturgical studies (like, e.g., Jakob Fluck's *Katholische Liturgik* in 1853), and when in France Dom Prosper Guéranger (1805–1875) laid the basis for a substantial study of the meaning of the liturgy through his unfinished masterpiece *L'année liturgique*. Both these influences, German Romanticism and the French restoration movement, have exerted a considerable influence on the emergence of the Liturgical Movement, and hence on the awareness of the eminent theological significance of the Church's "life of prayer." Interestingly, however, similar tendencies have existed in the Protestant world, with figures like the Lutheran pastors Nikolaj F. S. Grundtvig (1783–1872) in Denmark and Johann K. W. Löhe (1808–1872) in Germany, and members of the Oxford Movement in England, most notably John Keble (1792–1866) and Edward B. Pusey (1800–1882).

### Primary Sources

Excellent historical examples of liturgical theology are the mystagogical catecheses of Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Ambrose of Milan.<sup>68</sup> Practical editions of these texts in their original language together with a French translation, except for Theodore, are available in the renowned *Sources chrétiennes* series, which originated in the bosom of the Liturgical Movement and is published by Cerf in Paris: Ambrose, volume 25 (1994 [1950]); John Chrysostom, volume 50 (1970 [1950]); Cyrille of Jerusalem, volume 126 (2004 [1966]). English translations of Cyril's and Ambrose's works have been published as part of the Catholic University of America Press' *The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation* series. A marvelous study about the liturgy in the patristic era, which covers many primary sources from the Latin, Greek, and Syriac traditions is François Cassingena-Trévedy, *Les pères de l'Église et la liturgie. Un esprit, une expérience, de Constantin à Justinien* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 2009).

Paramount references to acquaint oneself with contemporary liturgical theology are Alexander Schmemmann, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology* (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003); Aidan Kavanagh, *On Liturgical Theology* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992); David W. Fagerberg, *Theologia Prima: What is Liturgical Theology?* (Chicago: HillenbrandBooks, 2004); and Gordon W. Lathrop, *Holy Things: A Liturgical Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993). Other works by the same authors—like *For the Life of the World: Sacraments and Orthodoxy* (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1973) and *Eucharist: Sacrament of the Kingdom* (Crestwood, NY: 1987) by Schmemmann; *Elements of Rite: A Handbook of Liturgical Style* by Kavanagh (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1990); *On Liturgical Asceticism* by Fagerberg (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2013); and the two other volumes of Lathrop's trilogy, *Holy People: A Liturgical Ecclesiology* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1999) and *Holy Ground: A Liturgical Cosmology* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2003)—are definitely worth reading as well. These works offer a more comprehensive insight into their authors' theological position.

As to the works of Dom Odo Casel and Romano Guardini, primacy of rank must be allotted to Casel's *The Mystery of Christian Worship* (New York: Crossroad, 1999) and Guardini's *The Spirit of the Liturgy* (New York: Crossroad, 1998), which were both edited in the Milestones of Catholic Theology series with interesting introductions by Aidan Kavanagh and Joanne M. Pierce, respectively. The original German titles of these works are *Das christliche Kultmysterium* and *Vom Geist der Liturgie*, of which several editions and translations exist. Further reading of Guardini must include *Von heiligen Zeichen* (*Sacred Signs*) and *Besinning vor der Feier der heiligen Messe* (*Meditations before Mass*). Unfortunately, apart from the one book mentioned, there are not many works of Casel available in English.

Another must-read, but a tough challenge to read it from cover to cover, is Cipriano Vagaggini's impressive volume *Theological Dimensions of the Liturgy: A General Treatise on the Theology of Liturgy* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1976), which first appeared in Italian and of which there exist translations in French and German as well. Another insightful book in the Italian tradition is Andrea Grillo, *Introduzione alla teologia liturgica. Approccio teorico alla Liturgia e ai sacramenti cristiani* (2d ed., Padua, Italy: Edizioni Messaggero, 2011). Through the references in this work, one may obtain insight into the work of important Italian liturgical theologians such as Salvatore Marsili, Giorgio Bonaccorso, Achille Triacca, and others.

To start at a lower level, one can benefit a lot from a selection of interesting texts, which are always introduced very nicely: Dwight W. Vogel (ed.), *Primary Sources of Liturgical Theology* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000). All the major players, with an emphasis on the Anglo-Saxon world, have found a voice in it. In the francophone world, a work of yet another kind deserves mention: Paul De Clerck, *L'intelligence de la liturgie* (2d ed., Paris: Cerf, 2005), in which the author undertakes an attempt to grasp liturgy's specificity and to demonstrate what the liturgy's own way of understanding things is.

Herder, the famous German publishing house, is currently publishing the collected works (*Gesammelte Schriften*) of two giants of contemporary theology: Walter Kasper and Joseph Ratzinger. Interestingly, the volumes containing their respective writings on liturgy were among the first to appear: Walter Kasper, *Die Liturgie der Kirche*, volume 10 (Freiburg, Basel, and Vienna: Herder, 2010); Joseph Ratzinger, *Theologie der Liturgie. Die sakramentale Begründung christlicher Existenz*, volume 11 (Freiburg, Basel, and Vienna: Herder, 2008). Although neither is generally known as a liturgical scholar, their articles and books about liturgy reveal a great deal about the interaction between fundamental theology and worship in 20th-century Roman Catholic theology.

### Links to Digital Materials

Reference can be made to abbeys with close ties to the Liturgical Movement:

- Maria Laach (near Andernach, Germany)
- Keizersberg (Mont César, Leuven, Belgium)
- Saint John (Collegeville, Minnesota)

Worth mentioning are also the leading journals in liturgical studies, some of which give proper attention to liturgical theology (and some which still have connections to aforementioned abbeys):

- *Worship*
- *Questions Liturgiques/Studies in Liturgy*
- *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*
- *La Maison-Dieu*
- *Liturgisches Jahrbuch*
- *Studia Liturgica*
- *Ecclesia Orans*
- *Ephemerides Liturgicae*
- *Rivista Liturgica*

International professional organizations of liturgists and liturgical theologians are:

- Societas Liturgica
- North American Academy of Liturgy (NAAL)

The official ecclesial bodies which issued the 1982 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (BEM) report and *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, Vatican II's 1963 constitution on the sacred liturgy, have put those texts on their website:

- World Council of Churches
- Holy See, the Vatican

## Further Reading

Berger, Teresa. "Liturgy: A Forgotten Subject Matter of Theology." *Studia Liturgica* 17 (1987): 10–18.

Bouyer, Louis. *La vie de la liturgie*. Lex orandi 20. Paris: Cerf, 1956. English translation: *Life and Liturgy*. London: Sheed and Ward, 1978. Originally published in 1962.

Cappuyns, Maïeul J. "Liturgie et Théologie." *Les Questions Liturgiques et Paroissiales* 19 (1934): 249–272.

Catella, Alceste. "Theology of the Liturgy." In *Handbook for Liturgical Studies*. Vol. 2, edited by Anscar J. Chupungco, 3–28. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998.

Dalmais, Irénée-Henri. "La liturgie comme lieu théologique." *La Maison-Dieu* 78 (1964): 97–106.

Geldhof, Joris. "Liturgy as Theological Norm. Getting Acquainted with 'Liturgical Theology.'" *Neue Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie und Religionsphilosophie* 52 (2010): 155–176.

Hoping, Helmut, and Birgit Jeggle-Merz, eds. *Liturgische Theologie. Aufgaben systematischer liturgiewissenschaft*. Paderborn, Germany: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2004.

Houssiau, Albert. "La redécouverte de la liturgie par la théologie sacramentaire." *La Maison-Dieu* 149 (1982): 27–55. English translation: "The Rediscovery of the Liturgy by Sacramental Theology (1950–1980)." *Studia Liturgica* 15 (1983): 158–177.

Irwin, Kevin W. *Context and Text. Method in Liturgical Theology*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1994.

Kilmartin, Edward J. *Christian Liturgy: Theology and Practice*. Kansas City, MO: Sheed and Ward, 1988.

LaCugna, Catherine M. "Can Liturgy Ever Become a Source for Theology?" *Studia Liturgica* 19 (1989): 1–13.

Mitchell, Nathan D. *Meeting Mystery: Liturgy, Worship, Sacraments*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2006.

Morrill, Bruce T. *Anamnesis as Dangerous Memory: Political and Liturgical Theology in Dialogue*. Collegeville, MN:

Liturgical Press, 2000.

Saliers, Don E. *Worship as Theology: Foretaste of Glory Divine*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1994.

Taft, Robert. "Liturgy as Theology." *Worship* 56 (1982): 113–117.

Weil, Louis. *A Theology of Worship*. Cambridge, MA: Cowley, 2002.

## Notes:

(1.) Excellent survey literature on the notion of "active participation" can be found in Jozef Lamberts, ed., *The Active Participation Revisited*, Textes et études liturgiques 19 (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2004); *La Maison-Dieu*, vol. 241 (2005); Martin Stuflesser, "Actuosa Participatio: Between Hectic Actionism and New Interiority: Reflections on 'Active Participation' in the Worship of the Church as both Right and Obligation of the Faithful," *Studia Liturgica* 41 (2011), 92–126; Tom Elich, "Full, Conscious and Active Participation," in *Vatican II: Reforming Liturgy*, ed. Carmel Pilcher, David Orr, and Elizabeth Harrington (Adelaide: ATF Theology, 2013), 25–42.

(2.) Undoubtedly, the most famous book on the spirit of the liturgy is Romano Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, Milestones in Catholic Theology (New York: Crossroad, 1998), the original German version of which appeared in 1918 under the title *Vom Geist der Liturgie*. The book inspired, among others, Joseph Ratzinger's *Der Geist der Liturgie* (2000).

(3.) See the inspiring reflections of Anscar Chupungco, *What, Then, Is Liturgy? Musings and Memoir* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2010).

(4.) For standard definitions on the liturgy, see, Aimé-Georges Martimort, "Notions preliminaries," in *L'église en prière. Introduction à la liturgie*, éd. A.-G. Martimort (Paris: Desclée & Cie, 1965), 3–14, 5–10; Liborius Olaf Lumma, *Crashkurs Liturgie. Eine kurze Einführung in den katholischen Gottesdienst* (Regensburg, Germany: Friedrich Pustet, 2010) 15–17.

(5.) These aspects are taken into account in Anscar Chupungco's definition of the liturgy: Anscar J. Chupungco, "A Definition of Liturgy," in *Handbook for Liturgical Studies*, vol. 1, ed. Anscar J. Chupungco (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1997), 3–10.

(6.) This idea is developed in some depth by Walter Kasper, *Aspekte einer Theologie der Liturgie. Liturgie angesichts der Krise der Moderne—für eine neue liturgische Kultur*, in *Die Liturgie der Kirche*, Gesammelte Schriften, vol. 10 (Freiburg, Basel, and Vienna: Herder, 2010), 15–83, 58–63.

(7.) For a subtle and at the same time challenging vision about the celebrating subject of the liturgy, which transcends the limits of space and time, see Yves Congar, "The *Ecclesia* or Christian Community as a Whole Celebrates the Liturgy," in *At the Heart of Christian Worship: Liturgical Essays of Yves Congar*, trans. and ed. Paul Philibert, (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2010), 15–67.

(8.) The symbolic nature of liturgy and sacraments has been a major issue since the so-called "linguistic turn." See, exemplarily, David N. Power, *Unsearchable Riches: The Symbolic Nature of the Liturgy* (New York: Pueblo, 1984); and Louis-Marie Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament. A Sacramental Reinterpretation of Christian Existence*, trans. Madeleine Beaumont (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1995).

(9.) Aimé-Georges, "Le double mouvement de la liturgie: culte de Dieu et sanctification des hommes," in A.-G. Martimort, *L'église en prière*, 193–203.

(10.) Chupungco, *What, Then, Is Liturgy?*

(11.) Geoffrey Wainwright, *Doxology: The Praise of God in Worship, Doctrine, and Life: A Systematic Theology* (London: Epworth, 1980).

(12.) The concept of encounter and its application to the sacraments have been groundbreakingly developed by Edward Schillebeeckx, *Christ the Sacrament of Encounter with God* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1963).

- (13.) For a thorough discussion of the concept of paschal mystery and its impact in the Liturgical Movement, see Winfried Haunerland, "Mysterium Paschale. Schlüsselbegriff liturgietheologischer Erneuerung," in *Liturgie als Mitte des christlichen Lebens*, ed. George Augustin and Kurt Koch (Freiburg, Basel, and Vienna: Herder, 2012), 189–209; and Simon A. Schrott, *Pascha-Mysterium. Zum liturgietheologischen Leitbegriff des Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzils*, Theologie der Liturgie, vol. 6 (Regensburg, Germany: Friedrich Pustet, 2014).
- (14.) This was magisterially demonstrated by Patrick Prétot, *L'adoration de la Croix. Triduum paschal*, Lex Orandi, nouvelle série 1 (Paris: Cerf, 2014).
- (15.) Laurence P. Hemming, *Worship as a Revelation: The Past, Present and Future of Catholic Liturgy* (London: Burns and Oates, 2008).
- (16.) Classical interpretations of the systematic-theological content of the liturgy are Ambroos Verheul, *Introduction to the Liturgy: Towards a Theology of Worship* (Wheathampstead, UK: Clarke, 1969); and Cipriano Vagaggini, *Theological Dimensions of the Liturgy. A General Treatise on the Theology of the Liturgy* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1976). For a contemporary discussion of the relationship between the two, see Julia Knop, *Ecclesia orans. Liturgie als Herausforderung für die Dogmatik* (Freiburg, Basel, and Vienna: Herder, 2012).
- (17.) The original text Dom Beauduin pronounced has been reedited on the occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of the event: Lambert Beaudin, "La vraie prière de l'église," *Questions Liturgiques/Studies in Liturgy* 91 (2010): 37–41. For a commentary, see André Haquin, "Dom Lambert Beauduin et le congrès des Œuvres Catholiques de Malines. À l'occasion du centenaire du Mouvement liturgique belge (1909–2009)," *Questions Liturgiques/Studies in Liturgy* 91 (2010): 18–36.
- (18.) Lambert Beauduin, *Liturgy: The Life of the Church*, trans. Virgil Michel (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1929). French original: *La piété de l'église: principes et faits* (Louvain, Belgium: Abbaye du Mont César, 1914).
- (19.) Maïeul Cappuyns, "Liturgie et Théologie," *Les Questions Liturgiques et Paroissiales* 19 (1934): 249–272.
- (20.) Frédéric Debuyst, *L'entrée en liturgie. Introduction à l'œuvre liturgique de Romano Guardini* (Paris: Cerf, 2008).
- (21.) Romano Guardini, "Ueber die systematische Methode in der Liturgiewissenschaft," *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 1 (1921): 97–108.
- (22.) Guardini, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*.
- (23.) Odo Casel, *The Mystery of Christian Worship* (New York: Crossroad, 1999).
- (24.) Arno Schilson, *Theologie als Sakramententheologie: Die Mysterientheologie Odo Casels* (Mainz, Germany: Matthias Grünewald, 1982).
- (25.) Joseph Ratzinger, "Die sakramentale Begründung christlicher Existenz," in *Die Liturgie der Kirche*, Gesammelte Schriften, vol. 11 (Freiburg, Basel, and Vienna: Herder, 2008), 197–214, 197.
- (26.) Alexander Schmemmann, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*, trans. Asheleigh E. Moorehouse (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003). Originally published in 1966.
- (27.) Aidan Kavanagh, *On Liturgical Theology* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992). Originally published in 1984.
- (28.) David W. Fagerberg, *Theologia Prima: What is Liturgical Theology?* (Chicago: HillenbrandBooks, 2004); Gordon Lathrop, *Holy Things: A Liturgical Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993).
- (29.) Paul De Clerck, "Lex Orandi—Lex Credendi: The Original Sense and Historical Avatars of an Equivocal Adage," *Studia Liturgica* 24 (1994): 178–200; Alexander Y. Hwang, *Intrepid Lover of Perfect Grace: The Life and Thought of Prosper of Aquitaine* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2009).
- (30.) Nathan D. Mitchell, and John F. Baldovin, eds., *Rule of Prayer, Rule of Faith: Essays in Honor of Aidan Kavanagh, O.S.B.* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996).



- (31.) Alexander Schmemmann, *Liturgy and Tradition: Theological Reflections of Alexander Schmemmann*, ed. Thomas Fisch (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1990), 18.
- (32.) Kavanagh, *On Liturgical Theology*, 91.
- (33.) Ibid., 89.
- (34.) Ibid., 3.
- (35.) See, for example, the very interesting article by Michael Aune, "Liturgy and Theology: Rethinking the Relationship." *Worship* 87 (2007), 46–86, 141–169.
- (36.) This is convincingly shown in a recent work by one of the leading liturgical historians of present day, Maxwell E. Johnson, *Praying and Believing in Early Christianity: The Interplay between Christian Worship and Doctrine* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2013).
- (37.) For two representative studies stemming from different historical and ecclesial contexts, see Jean Daniélou, *The Bible and the Liturgy* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002); and Gordon W. Lathrop, *The Four Gospels on Sunday: The New Testament and the Reform of Christian Worship* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012).
- (38.) See John F. Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship: The Origins, Development and Meaning of Stational Liturgy* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1987); Andrew B. McGowan, *Ancient Christian Worship: Early Church Practices in Social, Historical and Theological Perspective* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2014).
- (39.) Wainwright, *Doxology*; Gabriel Pivarnik, *Towards a Trinitarian Theology of Liturgical Participation* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2013); Joris Geldhof, ed., *Mediating Mysteries, Understanding Liturgies: On Bridging the Gap Between Liturgy and Systematic Theology* (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2015).
- (40.) Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament*; Id., *The Sacraments: The Word of God at the Mercy of the Body*, trans. Madeleine Beaumont (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001); David N. Power, *Sacrament: The Language of God's Giving* (New York: Crossroad, 1999).
- (41.) E. Byron Anderson and Bruce T. Morrill, eds., *Liturgy and the Moral Self: Humanity at Full Stretch before God. Essays in Honor of Don E. Saliers* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998); Bernd Wannenwetsch, *Political Worship: Ethics for Christian Citizens* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).
- (42.) Paul A. Janowiak, *Standing Together in the Community of God: Liturgical Spirituality and the Presence of Christ* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2011); David W. Fagerberg, *On Liturgical Asceticism* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2013); Thomas Quartier, *Liturgische spiritualiteit: Benedictijnse impulsen* (Heeswijk, The Netherlands: Abdij van Berne, 2013).
- (43.) William H. Willimon, *Worship as Pastoral Care* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1979); Joseph Gelineau, ed., *Dans vos assemblées. Manuel de pastorale liturgique* (Paris: Desclée, 1998); Kathleen Hughes, *Saying Amen: A Mystagogy of Sacrament* (Chicago: Liturgy Training, 1999); Bruce T. Morrill, *Divine Worship and Human Healing: Liturgical Theology at the Margins of Life and Death* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2009); Neil Pembroke, *Pastoral Care in Worship: Liturgy and Psychology in Dialogue* (London and New York: T & T Clark, 2010).
- (44.) Jean-Yves Lacoste, *Experience and the Absolute: Disputed Questions on the Humanity of Man* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2004).
- (45.) Catherine Pickstock, *After Writing: On the Liturgical Consummation of Philosophy* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998).
- (46.) Jean-Luc Marion, *God Without Being: Hors-texte*, 2d ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012).
- (47.) Giorgio Agamben, *The Kingdom and the Glory: For a Theological Genealogy of Economy and Government*, trans. Lorenzo Chiesa (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011); Id., *Opus Dei: An Archaeology of Duty*, trans. Adam Kotsko (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2013).

- (48.) Regina Schwartz, *Sacramental Poetics at the Dawn of Secularism: When God Left the World* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2008); Juliette J. Day, *Reading the Liturgy: An Exploration of Texts in Christian Worship* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2014).
- (49.) Nathan D. Mitchell, *Liturgy and the Social Sciences* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999).
- (50.) Gerard M. Lukken, *Per visibilia ad invisibilia: Anthropological, Theological, and Semiotic Studies on the Liturgy and the Sacraments*, ed. Louis Van Tongeren and Charles Caspers (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 1994); *Rituals in Abundance: Critical Reflections on the Place, Form and Identity of Christian Ritual in our Culture* (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2004); Melva Wilson Costen, *African American Christian Worship* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2007). Originally published in 1993.
- (51.) Benedikt Kranemann and Paul Post, eds., *Die modernen Ritual studies als Herausforderung für die Liturgiewissenschaft. Modern Ritual Studies as a Challenge for Liturgical Studies*, Liturgia Condenda 20 (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2009).
- (52.) Richard D. McCall, *Do This: Liturgy as Performance* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007); Roger B. Grainger, *The Drama of the Rite: Liturgy, Worship and Theatre Performance* (Brighton, UK: Sussex Academic Press, 2008).
- (53.) Katharine E. Harmon, *There Were Also Many Women There: Lay Women in the Liturgical Movement in the United States, 1926–59* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012); Teresa Berger, *Gender Differences and the Making of Liturgical History: Lifting a Veil on Liturgy's Past* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2011); Susan A. Ross, *Extravagant Affections: A Feminist Sacramental Theology* (New York: Continuum, 1998); Teresa Berger and Albert Gerhards, eds., *Liturgie und Frauenfrage. Ein Beitrag zur Frauenforschung aus liturgiewissenschaftlicher Sicht* (Sankt Ottilien, Germany: EOS, 1990).
- (54.) Joseph Gelineau, *Les chants de la messe dans leur enracinement rituel* (Paris: Cerf, 2001); Kathleen Harmon, *The Mystery We Celebrate, the Song We Sing: A Theology of Liturgical Music* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008).
- (55.) Albert Rouet, *Liturgy and the Arts*, trans. Paul Philibert. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1997; Bruce Ellis Benson, *Liturgy as a Way of Life: Embodying the Arts in Christian Worship* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2013).
- (56.) Graham Hughes, *Worship as Meaning: A Liturgical Theology for Late Modernity*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003; John D. Witvliet, *Worship Seeking Understanding: Windows into Christian Practice* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2003); Simon Chan, *Liturgical Theology: The Church as Worshiping Community* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2006).
- (57.) Melanie C. Ross, *Evangelical versus Liturgical? Defying a Dichotomy* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2014).
- (58.) See, exemplarily, Constantin Andronikof, *Le sens de la liturgie: La relation entre Dieu et homme* (Paris: Cerf, 1988); Baby Varghese, *West Syrian Liturgical Theology* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2004).
- (59.) Joyce A. Zimmermann, *Liturgy as Language of Faith: A Liturgical Methodology in the Mode of Paul Ricoeur's Textual Hermeneutics* (Lanham, MD, and New York: University Press of America, 1988); Id., *Liturgy and Hermeneutics* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998); Renato De Zan, "Criticism and Interpretation of Liturgical Texts" and "Liturgical Textual Criticism," in *Handbook for Liturgical Studies*, vol. 1, ed. Anscar J. Chupungco (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1997), 331–365 and 367–379; James Leachman and Daniel McCarthy, eds., *Appreciating the Collect: An Irenic Methodology* (Farnborough, UK: St. Michael Abbey's Press, 2008).
- (60.) Robert F. Taft, "The Structural Analysis of the Liturgical Units: An Essay in Methodology," *Worship* 52 (1978): 314–329.
- (61.) Lawrence A. Hoffman, *Beyond the Text: A Holistic Approach to Liturgy* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987).

(62.) For a book which explores these tensions, see Marianne Moyaert and Joris Geldhof (eds.), *Ritual Participation and Interreligious Dialogue: Boundaries, Transgressions and Innovations* (London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2015).

(63.) Albert Gerhards and Benedikt Kranemann, *Einführung in die Liturgiewissenschaft* (Darmstadt, Germany: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2006), 45–53.

(64.) Reinhard Messner, *Einführung in die Liturgiewissenschaft* (Paderborn, Germany: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2009), 19.

(65.) Kranemann and Post, *Modern Ritual Studies as a Challenge*.

(66.) Enrico Mazza, *Mystagogy: A Theology of Liturgy in the Patristic Age* (New York: Pueblo, 1989).

(67.) Enrico Mazza, *The Celebration of the Eucharist: The Origin of the Rite and the Development of Its Interpretation* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999).

(68.) Hugh M. Riley, *Christian Initiation: A Comparative Study in the Interpretation of the Baptismal Liturgy in the Mystagogical Writings of Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Ambrose of Milan*, Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity 17 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1974); Mazza, *Mystagogy*.

**Joris Geldhof**

University of Leuven

